

Comment Summary:
Offshore wind energy generation projects proposed
by Winergy, LLC

File Number: 200201108

Prepared for:
US Army Corps of Engineers
New England District
696 Virginia Road
Concord, MA 01742-2751

June 2003

TABLE OF CONTENTS**page #**

INTRODUCTION	5
TABLE 1: FEDERAL, STATE, AND NON-PROFIT COMMENTERS.....	6
1.0 FEDERAL, STATE, AND NON-PROFIT COMMENTS.....	7
1.1 Regulations and Permitting	7
1.2 Energy Technology.....	8
1.3 Economic Viability.....	9
1.4 Winergy, LLC	9
1.5 Project Guarantee	9
1.6 Alternatives	9
1.7 Placement	9
1.8 Construction, Maintenance, and Operations	9
1.9 Public Health.....	10
1.10 Public Safety	10
1.11 Aesthetic and Auditory Impacts	10
1.12 Environment	11
1.13 Fishing, Boating, and Recreation	12
1.14 Tourism.....	12
1.15 Historical and Archeological Value.....	12
1.16 Property Values	13
1.17 Public and Local Involvement.....	13
1.18 Local Economy.....	13
1.19 Economic Benefits.....	13
1.20 Davis Bank (MEPA #12992) and Nantucket Shoals (MEPA #12993).....	14
1.21 Falmouth (MEPA #12994).....	14
1.22 Gloucester (MEPA #12995).....	15
1.23 Truro (MEPA #12996).....	15
TABLE 2: FALMOUTH COMMENTERS	16
2.0 FALMOUTH (MEPA #12994) COMMENTS.....	21
2.1 Regulations and Permitting	21
2.2 Energy Technology.....	24
2.3 Economic Viability.....	24
2.4 Winergy, LLC	25
2.5 Project Guarantee	25
2.6 Alternatives	26
2.7 Placement	26
2.8 Construction, Maintenance, and Operations	26
2.9 Public Health.....	26
2.10 Public Safety	27
2.11 Aesthetic and Auditory Impacts	27
2.12 Environment	28
2.13 Fishing, Boating, and Recreation	29
2.14 Tourism.....	30
2.15 Historical and Archeological Value.....	30
2.16 Property Values	30
2.17 Public and Local Involvement.....	30

2.18	Local Economy.....	31
2.19	Economic Benefits.....	31
TABLE 3: ESSEX / GLOUCESTER COMMENTERS		32
3.0	ESSEX / GLOUCESTER (MEPA #12995) COMMENTS.....	33
3.1	Regulations and Permitting	33
3.2	Energy Technology.....	34
3.3	Economic Viability.....	35
3.4	Winery, LLC	35
3.5	Project Guarantee	36
3.6	Alternatives	36
3.7	Placement	36
3.8	Construction, Maintenance, and Operations	36
3.9	Public Health.....	37
3.10	Public Safety	37
3.11	Aesthetic and Auditory Impacts	38
3.12	Environment	38
3.13	Fishing, Boating, and Recreation	40
3.14	Tourism.....	41
3.15	Historical and Archeological Value.....	41
3.16	Property Values	41
3.17	Public and Local Involvement.....	42
3.18	Local Economy.....	42
3.19	Economic Benefits.....	42
TABLE 4: PROVINCETOWN / TRURO COMMENTERS		44
4.0	PROVINCETOWN / TRURO (MEPA #12996) COMMENTS	45
4.1	Regulations and Permitting	45
4.2	Energy Technology.....	45
4.3	Economic Viability.....	45
4.4	Winery, LLC	45
4.5	Project Guarantee	45
4.6	Alternatives	45
4.7	Placement	45
4.8	Construction, Maintenance, and Operations	46
4.9	Public Health.....	46
4.10	Public Safety	46
4.11	Aesthetic and Auditory Impacts	46
4.12	Environment	46
4.13	Fishing, Boating, and Recreation	46
4.14	Tourism.....	46
4.15	Historical and Archeological Value.....	46
4.16	Property Values	47
4.17	Public and Local Involvement.....	47
4.18	Local Economy.....	47
4.19	Economic Benefits.....	47
TABLE 5: NANTUCKET COMMENTERS		48

5.0	NANTUCKET (MEPA #12992 and #12993) COMMENTS	50
5.1	Regulations and Permitting	50
5.2	Energy Technology.....	51
5.3	Economic Viability.....	51
5.4	Winergy, LLC	51
5.5	Project Guarantee	52
5.6	Alternatives	52
5.7	Placement	52
5.8	Construction, Maintenance, and Operations	53
5.9	Public Health.....	53
5.10	Public Safety	53
5.11	Aesthetic and Auditory Impacts	53
5.12	Environment	54
5.13	Fishing, Boating, and Recreation	55
5.14	Tourism.....	56
5.15	Historical and Archeological Value.....	56
5.16	Property Values	56
5.17	Public and Local Involvement.....	56
5.18	Local Economy.....	56
5.19	Economic Benefits.....	57

TABLE 6: BOSTON / GENERAL COMMENTERS.....58

6.0	BOSTON / GENERAL COMMENTS.....	59
6.1	Regulations and Permitting	59
6.2	Energy Technology.....	59
6.3	Economic Viability.....	60
6.4	Winergy, LLC	60
6.5	Project Guarantee	60
6.6	Alternatives	60
6.7	Placement	60
6.8	Construction, Maintenance, and Operations	60
6.9	Public Health.....	60
6.10	Public Safety	60
6.11	Aesthetic and Auditory Impacts	61
6.12	Environment	61
6.13	Fishing, Boating, and Recreation	61
6.14	Tourism.....	62
6.15	Historical and Archeological Value.....	62
6.16	Property Values	62
6.17	Public and Local Involvement.....	62
6.18	Local Economy.....	62
6.19	Economic Benefits.....	62

INTRODUCTION

In February 2003, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), New England District (“the District”), received an application from Winergy, LLC for a permit under Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899, and Section 404 of the Clean Water Act to install wind turbine generators at one or more locations in navigable waters off the coast of Massachusetts. Public notice was issued on March 27, 2003, with a comment period extended to May 16, 2003. To facilitate public comment, the District held state/federal hearings in Falmouth, Essex, Provincetown, Nantucket, and Boston, Massachusetts. Oral and written comments were also accepted during the public comment period. The purpose of the public comment period was to gather comments to assist the District in defining the issues to be evaluated for the preparation of an Environmental Assessment and to help determine if an Environmental Impact Statement is necessary. All interested Federal, State and local agencies, affected Indian tribes, interested private and public organizations, and individuals were invited to attend the public meetings. The attached Comment Summary document summarizes comments received by the District during the public comment period. Comments were received verbally at the public meetings, in writing, and by e-mail. This Comment Summary document does not replace the comments themselves; it is merely a tool to organize the comments received into subject matter categories.

Commenters are listed in alphabetical order in Table 1, with their corresponding Commenter Number. Table 1 also indicates the type of testimony that was given by each Commenter (written, verbal, or both).

Table 1. COMMENTERS FOR STATE, FEDERAL, AND NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS

Comenter Number	Commenter	Commenter Organization
1	Allen, Dorothy (written)	Nahant Wind Power and Alternative Energy Committee
2	Bartlett, Michael J. (written)	Supervisor, NE Field Office, U.S. Fish and Wildlife
3	Burks, Maria (written)	Superintendent, National Park Service
4	Clarke, John J. (written)	Director of Advocacy, Mass Audubon
5	Colosi, Robert D. (written)	Assistant Regional Administrator for Habitat Conservation, NOAA
6	Diodati, Paul J. (written)	Director, Massachusetts Division of Marine Fisheries
7	Fenn, Margo (written)	Executive Director, Cape Cod Commission
8	Hicks, Toni (written)	Staff Attorney, Conservation Law Foundation
9	Higgins, Elizabeth A. (written)	Director, Office of Environmental Review, Environmental Protection Agency
10	Kendall, Andrew W. (written)	Executive Director, The Trustees of Reservations
11	Mastone, Victor T. (written)	Director, Massachusetts Board of Underwater Archaeological Resources
12	Neill, Christopher (written)	Group Chair, Cape Cod Group of the Sierra Club
13	O'Connor, David L. (written)	Commissioner, Massachusetts Division of Energy Resources
14	O'Leary, Robert (written)	Senator, Commonwealth of Massachusetts
15	Rust, Marie (written)	Regional Director, National Park Service
16	Simon, Brona (written)	State Archeologist, Massachusetts Historical
17	Skinner, Tom (written)	Director, Massachusetts Office of Coastal Zone Management
18	Webber, Peter (written)	Commissioner, Massachusetts Department of Environmental Management
19	Young, Sharon (written)	Marine Issues Field Director, The Humane Society of the United States and the International Wildlife Coalition

1.0 STATE, FEDERAL, AND NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS

1.1 REGULATIONS AND PERMITTING

COMMENT: The Commenters state that an EIS and/or EIR should be required for each project. One Commenter states that an EIS/EIR should incorporate comments and recommendations for research made by the coordinating agencies with specific expertise in wildlife and the environment, including but not exclusive to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the National Marine Fisheries Service, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and the National Park Service. One Commenter states that an EIS/EIR should be required for each project, with a scope duration and level of study that is similar to the Cape Wind project.

[2, 7, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 19]

COMMENT: Some Commenters state that comprehensive EIS/EIR should be required, through a coordinated state/federal review process pursuant to the MEPA and NEPA. Some Commenters state that the EIS/EIR should address whether or not the proposed projects are allowable under the Ocean Sanctuaries Act (OSA), and if so, how the proposed projects will meet the OSA requirements. One Commenter states that the EIS/EIR should address the use of public trust areas for private use. Some Commenters state that the state and federal governments should work together to develop a comprehensive programmatic EIS/EIR, including a statewide siting plan and criteria for wind energy development in Massachusetts/New England, which could use funds for the energy deregulation law (Chapter 164 of the Acts of 1997) administered by the Massachusetts Technology Collaborative. One Commenter states that the cumulative impacts of multiple wind energy projects should be considered in both statewide planning for wind farm siting and in the environmental review and permitting process for individual species. One Commenter adds that an assessment of potential wind farm sites should be expanded to include other locations along the northeastern U.S. nearshore continental shelf, to improve future decision-making. Some Commenters state that the USACE should safeguard public interest by using its authority under Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act. Some Commenters state that the EIS/EIR should address whether or not construction of wind turbines falls under the licensing requirements of Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 91 and the Massachusetts waterways regulations, 310 CMR 9.00-9.55.

[2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 12, 14, 17, 19]

COMMENT: The Commenters state that State and federal leasing programs should be developed to guide offshore wind farm development, ensure appropriate compensation to the public, avoid unacceptable conflicts with other public interests in these public trust areas, and minimize environmental impacts. One Commenter states that the proposed project would conflict with some existing uses such as fishing and recreation; the Minerals Management Service (of the Department of Interior) has identified areas as possible sources of sand and gravel subject to federal regulation; and the applicant has requested limits on other uses on and surrounding the site. One Commenter states that the EIS/EIR should address compatibility of the project proposals with all existing federal, state, regional, and local legal, regulatory, and policy requirements and plans.

[4, 17]

COMMENT: The Commenters state that Winergy's ENFs lack the project-specific information required for an accurate assessment.

[2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 13, 15, 17]

COMMENT: One Commenter states that the proposed transmission cable will cross the Cape Cod National Seashore and will therefore require a Right-of-Way permit from the National Park Service, which requires submission of an EIS. One Commenter states that any changes to the siting of the five proposed cable landfalls and cable routes should reference whether there may be potential direct environmental impacts within Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC).

[15, 18]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that because of the likely presence of threatened and endangered species, such as the roseate tern and the piping plover, certain analyses should be undertaken for the project to proceed in compliance with Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA). The Commenter states that since this project is considered a “major construction activity”, a biological assessment pursuant to Section 7(c) of the ESA is required.

[2]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that Winergy projects may preclude local towns from proceeding with their own wind power development that is possible in the deregulated electricity market.

[1]

1.2 ENERGY TECHNOLOGY

COMMENT: The Commenter states that an assessment of the amount of fossil fuel consumption that is replaced needs to be conducted, along with an assessment of the project's potential to help reach fossil fuel reduction targets.

[12]

COMMENT: The Commenters state that an assessment of the amount of fossil fuel emissions that are displaced as a result of implementing wind energy needs to be conducted.

[12, 17]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that the EIS/EIR should describe the potential for renewable energy in the region and project its market share potential.

[7]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that Government agencies must be prepared for wind power proposals by identifying acceptable wind power project locales and should examine the approach and experience in Europe.

[1]

1.3 ECONOMIC VIABILITY

COMMENT: The Commenter states that the EIS/EIR should contain a thorough economic analysis of the potential loss of fishing grounds due to the proposed project.

[8]

1.4 WINERGY, LLC

COMMENT: The Commenter states that the EIS/EIR should discuss the future goals of Winergy, primarily concerning the company's intentions to maintain and/or operate the facility or to transfer the responsibility to a third party, pay fees for use of the resource, and whether all of the sites currently under consideration will be pursued.

[7]

1.5 PROJECT GUARANTEE

NO COMMENT

1.6 ALTERNATIVES

COMMENT: The Commenter states that the EIS/EIR should broaden the consideration of alternatives to include a range of sites.

[19]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that the EIS/EIR should include a discussion of alternative wind farm sites that were considered, if any, and reasons for why they were not chosen. The EIS/EIR should include a discussion of the chosen number and configuration of towers at each site.

[7]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that the applicant should perform a comprehensive Alternatives Analysis for each proposed location, including offshore and landside alternatives, with each site's ability to fulfill all of the necessary wind energy siting parameters weighed against its potential impacts on fisheries resources and habitat.

[6]

1.7 PLACEMENT

NO COMMENT

1.8 CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE, AND OPERATIONS

COMMENT: The Commenters state that the EIS/EIR should include impacts due to construction, existence, and maintenance; alternatives (including alternative locations); and mitigation measures. In addition, the EIS/EIR should explore the impacts of the proposed and alternative construction methods, with a detailed description of the construction schedule.

[1, 8]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that wind projects should be constructed and operated in a manner that does not have disproportionate or unnecessary adverse impacts on critical environmental resources.

[8]

COMMENT: The Commenters state that the EIS/EIR should fully document all construction methodology and maintenance requirements, including plans for handling and disposing of oil and other hazardous or toxic materials. One Commenter states that the EIS/EIR should include construction details and equipment specifications for all aspects of the project; include data and analysis on anticipated structural fatigue and replacement schedules; describe the anticipated maintenance schedule; and include a contingency plan for emergency maintenance.

[4, 7, 17]

COMMENT: The Commenters state that the EIS/EIR should include plans and describe the funding mechanism that will be provided for decommissioning or replacement of the facilities when they reach the end of their operational lifespan, which should include reinstatement of the ocean floor. One Commenter states that the permit requires that a bond be offered for the removal of any turbines once wind production activities are completed.

[4, 7, 8, 10, 14]

1.9 PUBLIC HEALTH

COMMENT: The Commenter states that the impacts on human health by replacing emissions from fossil fuel generating plants need to be assessed.

[12]

1.10 PUBLIC SAFETY

COMMENT: The Commenter states that the Massachusetts Aeronautics Commission and Federal Aviation Administration should be consulted regarding visual flight rules and any requirements regarding the lighting and marking.

[17]

1.11 AESTHETIC AND AUDITORY IMPACTS

COMMENT: Some Commenters are concerned about the visual impact of the wind farms. Some Commenters state that the EIS/EIR should include an analysis of the projects' visual impacts, with visual simulations provided by Winergy to allow for public review.

[2, 3, 8, 17]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that the structure visibility needs to be assessed.

[12]

COMMENT: The Commenters state that noise needs to be assessed, including noise that is anticipated to occur during construction, maintenance, and operation.
[2, 12, 17]

1.12 ENVIRONMENT

COMMENT: The Commenter states that the EIS/EIR should include regional scale information that shows the entirety of each proposed wind farm site and associated cable extent, with Ocean Sanctuaries, Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC), and other designations or environmental boundaries delineated, including transmission cable routes, wetland delineations, mean high water line, and rare species habitat delineations. In addition the EIS/EIR should address potential indirect impacts to ACECs, such as areas where the Diamondback Terrapin is known to nest, with commitments to future monitoring. The EIS/EIR should include plans to mitigate impacts to resources in sanctuaries. The EIS/EIR should address the potential impacts of each proposal on the seabed and associated marine life and habitat values during and after installation of the foundations, wind towers, and transmission cables.
[18]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that the work should be done closely with NMFS to develop a means of assessing project impacts to federally endangered or threatened species such as: humpback whale, fin whale, northern right whale, loggerhead turtle, Kemp's Ridley turtle, and leatherback turtle.
[17]

COMMENT: The Commenters state that the EIS/EIR should address scientific concerns such as impacts to waterfowl, migratory shore birds and land birds, fisheries, and other animal life (with particular emphasis on roseate terns, piping plovers, wintering seaducks, and migrating passerines). The concerns to be addressed include changes to migration patterns, changes in benthic habitat, impacts from transmission cable lines, impacts from warning lights, and siting where environmental impacts are low. One Commenter states that the EIS/EIR should involve an assessment of bird usage patterns in and around each of the proposed sites, with a minimum of three years of data collected to ensure that the natural seasonal and year-to-year variability are taken into account. One Commenter states that the government agencies should work in cooperation with organizations, such as the Audubon Society, to establish an avian database on bird habitats, nesting areas, and migration routes.
[1, 4, 5, 8, 10, 17, 18]

COMMENT: Some Commenters state that the EIS/EIR should address rare and non-rare marine and non-marine habitats. Some Commenters state that the EIS/EIR should address plans for minimizing disturbance to the benthic community.
[3, 4, 15]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that the EIS/EIR should address pre- and post-construction activities in the proposed wind farm sites, including post-construction monitoring to document wildlife impact (such as mortality and population impacts). The EIS/EIR should include detailed information on the characteristics of the proposed sites and transmission routes based on existing

and additional studies, which should be developed with input from, and approved by state and federal wildlife agencies.

[4]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that the EIS/EIR should address the impacts of construction and maintenance on natural resources, including fisheries (bluefish, sea bass, scup), eelgrass beds, and other shoreline and surf zone habitats; seabirds, including white-winged scoter, surf scoters, black scoters, long-tailed ducks, red-throated loons, horned grebes, common eiders, roseate terns, and piping plovers; shorebirds; and land-based resources.

[12, 17]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that the EIR should include: a description of the engineering analysis related to the design and sizing of the foundation structures; a detailed analysis of impacts to the near-shore and inter-tidal area at the cable landfall point; a description of the proposed "jet plow" and its operation; detailed drawings and descriptions of any scour aprons to be used with the foundations including material size and area coverage. The Commenter states that the ENF does not indicate whether the applicant has already collected data on geological conditions at the sites but the following information should be provided: geological data collection plan and methods; compatibility of geological conditions with proposed method of tower construction and cable installation; comparison of geological conditions at Winergy's proposed sites with those at marine installations in other locations; and analysis of the similarities and differences at these sites and a discussion of the impact of differences on the long-term viability of the Winergy project.

[17]

1.13 FISHING, BOATING, AND RECREATION

COMMENT: Some Commenters state that the EIS/EIR should address potential impacts to commercial and recreational uses such as fishing and boating. Some Commenters state that the EIS/EIR should include an analysis of the projects' navigational impacts.

[2, 4, 7, 8, 17]

COMMENT: The Commenters state that the impacts on the fishing industry, including fishermen, need to be assessed.

[12, 17]

1.14 TOURISM

COMMENT: The Commenter states that the impacts on tourism need to be assessed.

[12]

1.15 HISTORICAL AND ARCHEOLOGICAL VALUE

COMMENT: The Commenters state that the project scope should include a comprehensive plan to identify historic properties within the project's area of potential effect, including all properties listed in the State and National Registers of Historic Places, properties in Massachusetts Historic

Commission's (MHC's) Inventory of Historic and Archeological Assets, and properties not yet identified which may be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. One Commenter also states that the scope should determine the visual effects to historic properties on Nantucket Island. Some commenters state that the project scope should include a reconnaissance cultural and resource archeological survey to be conducted in accordance with the permitting requirements of the Massachusetts Board of Underwater Archeological Resources, the National Historic Preservation Act, the Archeological Resources Protection Act, and MEPA.
[3, 10, 11, 15, 16, 17]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that the project scope should include clear reproductions of USGS locus maps that depict the proposed underwater and aboveground cable routes so that an assessment of the cables' interaction with archeologically sensitive sites can be conducted.
[16]

1.16 PROPERTY VALUES

NO COMMENT

1.17 PUBLIC AND LOCAL INVOLVEMENT

COMMENT: The Commenters state that Winergy's ENF lacks information and leaves the public with no basis for in-depth review. Winergy should be required to provide supplemental information, which should then be followed by another opportunity for public comment.
[8, 17]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that a web-based data center should be made available by USACE.
[12]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that the planning process should allow ample opportunity for public comment.
[4]

1.18 LOCAL ECONOMY

NO COMMENT

1.19 ECONOMIC BENEFITS

COMMENT: The Commenter states that information on the effects on energy price, particularly to Cape Cod, needs to be provided.
[12]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that ensuring an adequate supply of renewable energy is an ongoing priority.
[13]

1.20 DAVIS BANK (MEPA #12992) AND NANTUCKET SHOALS (MEPA #12993)

COMMENT: One Commenter states that the EIS/EIR should include information on Long-tailed ducks, and Little, Lesser Black-backed, and Ireland gull populations, which should be collected in the winter. The EIS/EIR should address the feasibility of constructing and maintaining towers that are situated in areas with intense wind and wave energies. The EIS/EIR should address site-specific coastal geology and erosion dynamics at locations where transmission lines will reach landfall. One Commenter states concern regarding the potential impacts to the physical habitat of the Nantucket Shoals and the avian, benthic, and pelagic species and populations that utilized that habitat.

[2, 4]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that in addition to a number of reported shipwrecks southeast of Nantucket Island, there have been at least 112 reported shipwreck incidents in the vicinity of Nantucket Shoals for which accurate locations are not readily determined.

[11]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that mitigation measures should be incorporated into the permit if the wind farms will result in visual effects on the character of Nantucket (as an area that is listed in the State and National Registers of Historic Places and as a National Historic Landmark) during the daytime and nighttime, and if there is disturbance to underwater Native American sites or historic period shipwrecks.

[14]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that construction methods and design standards need to be appropriate for wind turbine structures that are built on the Nantucket Shoals, where there are highly uncertain and unique risks due to high energy landform movement and large storm waves.

[2]

1.21 FALMOUTH (MEPA #12994)

COMMENT: The Commenter states that the EIS/EIR should include avian studies, with particular focus on the federally-listed endangered Roseate Terns.

[4]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that the applicant needs to fully address environmental and appearance (sic) requirements of the Ocean Sanctuaries Act.

[18]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that in addition to a number of charted shipwrecks in this portion of Buzzards Bay, there have been at least thirty reported shipwreck incidents in the vicinity of Gunning Point and Quissett Harbor for which accurate locations are not readily determined.

[11]

1.22 GLOUCESTER (MEPA #12995)

COMMENT: The Commenter states that the EIS/EIR should include avian studies, with particular focus on petrels, alcids, gulls, loons, grebes, gannets, Piping Plovers, Least Terns, as well as many other types of migratory and non-migratory shorebird, landbirds, and passerines. The EIS/EIR should include an evaluation of river herring, striped bass, and other fish populations that use the waters at the proposed sites.

[4]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that historic and scenic property locations should be compiled in consultation with the Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities, the Massachusetts Historical Commission, the local historical commissions of the Towns and Cities on Ipswich Bay, and The Trustees of Reservations.

[10]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that in addition to at least 22 reported shipwrecks in the vicinity of Davis Neck and Annisquam River, there have been at least 9 reported shipwreck incidents off Cape Ann for which accurate locations are not readily determined.

[11]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that the applicant needs to fully address environmental and appearance (sic) requirements of the Ocean Sanctuaries Act.

[18]

1.23 TRURO (MEPA #12996)

COMMENT: The Commenter states that the EIS/EIR should address issues of compatibility of this project site with the National Seashore, including the proposed landfall of transmission cables through the Seashore. The EIS/EIR should evaluate bird activity patterns in the area.

[4]

COMMENT: The Commenters state that the proposal to install wind turbines off Truro is not allowed under the Ocean Sanctuaries Act, and the Act does not allow exceptions.

[14, 18]

Commenters are listed in alphabetical order in Table 2, with their corresponding Commenter Number. Table 2 also indicates the type of testimony that was given by each Commenter (written, verbal, or email).

Table 2. COMMENTERS FOR FALMOUTH (MEPA #12994)

Commenter Number	Commenter
1	Adams, Janice (written)
2	Allen, Cynthia (email)
3	Allen, Thomas (email)
4	Allen, William (email)
5	Almy, Jessica (verbal)
6	Bacon, Caroline (written)
7	Bacon, Charles (written)
8	Bakalar, David (written)
9	Balz, Caroline C. (written)
10	Barry, David A. (written)
11	Beal, Bruce A. (written)
12	Beers, Deborah Y. (written)
13	Bennett, George F. (written)
14	Bernstein, Joshua B. (written)
15	Bernstein, Norman (written)
16	Billings, Barbara, M and Stephen R. (written)
17	Birenstein, Linda and Bernie (written)
18	Bolton, Elizabeth D (email)
19	Bonczek, Lon F. (written)
20	Bunstein, Iris (written)
21	Burt, C. David (written)
22	Burt, Edward M. (written)
23	Burt, Jonathan and Kathryn (email)
24	Butcher, Benjamin S. (written)
25	Cameron, Gerald T., Jr. (written)
26	Cavanaugh III, Joseph F. (written)
27	Chalmers, Stephen (email)
28	Clark, James M. Jr. (written)
29	Clouse, Marian U. (email)
30	Coffin, Cynthia and John (written)
31	Cohen, Mitchell and Leslie (written)
32	Collis, Elfriede A. (written)
33	Cook, Joseph and Elizabeth (written)
34	Cooper, Douglas E. (written)
35	Cooper, Katherine H. (written)

Table 2 (Continued). COMMENTERS FOR FALMOUTH (MEPA #12994)

Commenter Number	Commenter
36	Coughlin, James C. (written)
37	Cross, Sally M. (written)
38	Dabney, Thomas and Virginia (written)
39	DeMello, George and Claire M. (written)
40	DeWhite, Edward (written)
41	DiCecca, Charles (written)
42	Dixon, Joseph and Helen (written)
43	Dragone, Allan and Jane (written)
44	Driscoll, Elizabeth (written)
45	Driscoll, Robert W.(written)
46	Driscoll, Sonya D. (written)
47	Due, Marcia (written)
48	Dugan, William P. (written)
49	Edson, Susan (email)
50	Egloff, Frank (written)
51	Eldred, Emmett (written)
52	Eldred, Joanne (written)
53	Ellis, Rutherford L. Jr. (written)
54	Ells, Stephen (email)
55	Evans, J. Randall and Lynn (written)
56	Farrell, Paul G. and Heather K. (written)
57	Farrell, Pauline G. (written)
58	Farrell, Quintus (written)
59	Farrell, Sam (written)
60	Fay, Jamie (verbal)
61	Feinrick, Norman (written)
62	Fenlon, Michael N. (written)
63	Finnegan, Louis J. and Christina M. Lewis (written)
64	Fish, Lawrence K. (written)
65	Follick, Michael J., Ph.D. (written)
66	Fontaine, George C. (written)
67	Foot, Ken (verbal)
68	Furie, Bruce (written)
69	German, James L. (written)
70	German, Margaret (written)

Table 2 (Continued). COMMENTERS FOR FALMOUTH (MEPA #12994)

Commenter Number	Commenter
71	Gindra, Bill (verbal)
72	Goldman, Mary (written)
73	Goldstein, Edward (written)
74	Good, Gerald P. (written)
75	Goodwin, Charlotte and Charles (written)
76	Grant, Carlton W. and Gladys E. (written)
77	Gruson, Martha C. (written)
78	Hampson, George R. (written)
79	Hastings, William A. (written)
80	Hemstreet, Jean M. (written)
81	Hike, William (verbal)
82	Ho, James K. (written)
83	Hogan, Paul F. and Patricia A. (written)
84	Honnoyan, Holly (written)
85	Howard, Mary Jean (written)
86	Hynes, Todd (verbal)
87	Keen, M. Whitney (written)
88	Kelting, Whitney (written)
89	Klotz, Charles R. (written)
90	Kronenberg, Anne (written)
91	Kuykendall, Virginia (verbal)
92	Kuykendall, Virginia (written)
93	Lauer, Thomas and Helene (written)
94	Levy, William L. (verbal)
95	Little, Arthur D. (written)
96	Lormg, Barbara P. (written)
97	Macero, Rosemary A. (written)
98	MacPhee, Don (email)
99	Makela, Mary E. (written)
100	Malloy, Ken (verbal)
101	Mandile, John and Catherine (written)
102	Mann, Charles K. (written)
103	McElvein, Richard B. and Priscilla (written)
104	McGrath, Michael (verbal and written)
105	Meehan, Michael and Agnese (written)

Table 2 (Continued). COMMENTERS FOR FALMOUTH (MEPA #12994)

Commenter Number	Commenter
106	Merriam III, Edmund A. (email)
107	Michaelson, Richard A. (written)
108	Miller, Paul J. and Finnegan, Louis, J. (written)
109	Mooney, James (written)
110	Murphy, William P. (written)
111	Needham, Ellen L. (written)
112	Needham, George A. (written)
113	Neill, Chris (verbal)
114	Nye, Tara (verbal)
115	Olsen, Christopher and Elizabeth (email)
116	Patrick, Martha F. (written)
117	Pechelis, William J. and Kay Dillon (written)
118	Pendleton, Nancy (written)
119	Perwak, Gary (written)
120	Price, Martha S and John S. (written)
121	Rasic, Carol (written)
122	Rasmussen, Mark (verbal)
123	Reid, Susan M. (written)
124	Roberts, Keith (email)
125	Rooney, George (verbal)
126	Rosen, Isaac (verbal)
127	Sacchini, Jeanette (written)
128	Santostefano, Sebastiano (written)
129	Scanlon, Deborah G. (written)
130	Sebestyen, John G., M.D. (written)
131	Segalini, Sandro (verbal)
132	Shah, Kathy and Alkesh (written)
133	Shriner, Richard W. (email)
134	Singer, Robin (written)
135	Sippewissett Association (verbal)
136	Smith, Dana K. (written)
137	Smith, Fred (verbal)
138	Smith, Frederick E. (written)
139	Smith, George L. (written)
140	Smith, Karin L. (written)

Table 2 (Continued). COMMENTERS FOR FALMOUTH (MEPA #12994)

Commenter Number	Commenter
141	Smith, Mr. and Mrs. H. Kerner (written)
142	Stover, Katharine S. (written)
143	Summers, Peter (written)
144	Swift, E. Kent Jr. (written)
145	Taylor, Allan E. (written)
146	Taylor, Kathleen C. (written)
147	Thayer, Heleni (verbal)
148	Tillery, Kathleen M. (written)
149	Truesdale, Pamela (written)
150	Trustee, Susan McMoran (written)
151	Tullius, Thomas D. (written)
152	Turkington, Representative Eric (verbal)
153	Waasdorp, Peter (verbal - rep. Sippewisset Assoc.)
154	Waasdorp, Peter (verbal - rep. himself)
155	Wagner, Rose (written)
156	Ward, Peter M. (written)
157	Ware, Marian H. (written)
158	Webber, Nina H. (written)
159	Weissmann, Gerald (written)
160	Whitney, Nina (written)
161	Williams, Dwight (written)
162	Williams, Virginia F. (written)
163	Yassky, Charles (written)
164	Yost, George J. and Marjorie S. (written)
165	Young, Sharon (verbal)
166	Zezza, Carlo (written)
167	Zimmerman, Robert A. and Athleen K. (written)

2.0 FALMOUTH (MEPA #12994)

2.1 REGULATIONS AND PERMITTING

COMMENT: The Commenter states that USACE should coordinate with EPA and the US Fish and Wildlife Service. Some Commenters state that there needs to be a Federal and State process that is linked.

[5, 6, 113]

COMMENT: One Commenter states that the Federal government should conduct a programmatic review to set standards and guiding principles, and to consider alternatives before a project of this type is approved. Some Commenters state that projects of this type should be assessed in relationship to all of the projects of this type that are being proposed for the eastern seaboard, rather than assessing them and approving them in an individual, piecemeal fashion. One Commenter is concerned that the proposed projects are too different from one another for USACE to adequately evaluate each one.

[113, 122, 126, 165]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that before permitting a wind farm, there needs to be a comprehensive coastal zoning plan that locates appropriate sites for wind development on the basis of maximizing public benefits and minimizing damage to the marine and human environment rather than on the basis of desirability to a private developer. A licensing plan should accompany this process, allowing for competitive bidding for approved sites, so that the Commonwealth's citizens might be compensated for the private for-profit use of public resources. Such a plan would also include certifying a developer's financial and technical ability to undertake such a project.

[135]

COMMENT: Some Commenters state that these waters are designated as an ocean sanctuary, as part of the Cape and Islands Ocean Sanctuary. These sanctuaries were designated to protect the near shore waters of the Commonwealth from exploitation for commercial and industrial purposes and to preserve the natural resources and scenic values of the sanctuary. They continue by saying that the waters are under the care of the MA Department of Environmental Management (DEM), with the duty to protect and preserve these valuable natural resources. MA DEM is prohibited from approving an electric generating facility located in the ocean sanctuary unless it determines that all Federal, State, and local certificates, licenses, permits, and approvals have been obtained, and is in compliance with any applicable general and special statutes, rules, regulations, and orders.

[9, 60]

COMMENT: Some Commenters state that the submerged lands in the Commonwealth fall under Article 97 of the State Constitution, entitled "The Right of People to Clean Air and Water," which provides freedom from excess and unnecessary noise, and natural scenic, historic, and aesthetic qualities of the environment. Article 97 requires a two-thirds vote of the legislature in order to allow the use of the waters for anything other than its conservation use, meaning that DEM cannot approve the proposed wind farm until legislation has been passed. MEPA is urged

to address Article 97, the required two-thirds vote, all provisions of the Executive Office of Environmental Affairs, and all the detailed findings required by DEM.
[19, 60, 99, 130, 135]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that there is a categorical restriction against fill and structures for nonwater dependent use on flow tidelands under 9.32 of Chapter 91. The Commenter also states that there are significant issues about the No Adverse Impact Standard for activity in land under ocean in the Wetlands Protection Act. Another Commenter states that the local wetlands bylaw has performance standards, which state that there is to be no new construction allowed in a velocity zone. Some Commenters state that the waters are presumed to be significant to fisheries, wildlife, recreation, and aesthetics under the local wetlands regulations.
[58, 60, 104]

COMMENT: Some Commenters state that a proposal to construct windmills in the Bay would require a zoning change or variance of Falmouth wetlands regulations. One Commenter would like to see public ocean zoning controls in place before these processes continue. One Commenter is concerned that the locations selected are not zoned as industrial.
[12, 33, 36, 39, 52, 75, 132, 134]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that under local permits, the wind farm activities are not permissible because the windmills would be within two miles of mean low water, and are therefore subject to jurisdiction in the Falmouth zoning bylaw. Some Commenters state that the Falmouth zoning bylaw allows windmills by special permit, but only if the windmills are located on an upland area and conform to zoning. Since the windmills are not proposed for an upland area, they are not permissible under the Town of Falmouth zoning.
[104, 132]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that local permits should be investigated before moving forward with Federal and State Environmental Impact Studies. The Commenter states that the proposed route and its relationship to the end of Gray Lane, existing local bylaws, existing easements, and existing conditions (i.e., the presence of dunes) needs to be studied. The Commenter also states that acquisition of easement rights may be required for the building of the cable on the projected route from Gray Lane to the water.
[104]

COMMENT: Some Commenters are concerned that the proposed waters are public domain and should be used for public benefit, not privatization. Some Commenters state that Winergy lacks the requisite property rights to build in public-owned waters and that there is no Federal law that establishes a regulatory program for issuing permits for this type of facility -- to adequately protect public lands and waters. Some Commenters state that any approval of this project is premature and reckless in the absence of State and Federal regulatory guidelines designed to protect public interests.
[11, 15, 16, 17, 23, 24, 26, 28, 29, 30, 34, 35, 37, 49, 50, 63, 66, 76, 77, 79, 80, 81, 87, 82, 87, 88, 90, 96, 98, 101, 104, 106, 109, 112, 115, 118, 122, 126, 127, 133, 136, 140, 142, 143, 149, 151, 152, 157, 160, 167]

COMMENT: Some Commenters state that the EIS should address whether or not USACE has permitting jurisdiction, and whether or not the applicant has legal right to develop on the proposed land.
[5, 37, 135]

COMMENT: Some Commenters state that USACE should require a full Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Some Commenters state that USACE should require a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).
[5, 42, 54, 87, 112, 114, 123, 135, 151, 165]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that the EIS should identify and discuss the existing benthic resources and vegetation in these areas and the likely impacts the project would have on them, as well as mitigation that will be taken. The EIS should set forth a more detailed description of construction plans, an assessment of alternative methods of construction, and how the proponent will minimize construction impacts. The EIS should set forth a decommissioning plan, including a mechanism to ensure funding for the decommissioning and a description of how environmental impacts of decommissioning will be minimized. The EIS should include an evaluation of alternative feasible technologies for generating 18 MW of electricity. This evaluation should contain a comparative environmental analysis for 18 MW fossil fuel-burning power plants on the mainland, including such aspects as air emissions, water use, fisheries, and avian impacts and other environmental impacts. The evaluation should contain sufficient information to demonstrate why the proponent has chosen its proposed site off the shore of Falmouth and why other sites were deemed infeasible for this particular project.
[123]

COMMENT: The Commenters state that an independent review of research findings should be conducted as part of the EIS process, and should examine the impact of construction, operation and decommissioning of wind turbines on marine turtles, migrating and wintering birds, marine mammals, and fish, as well as the installation of underwater cable and its potential effects on wildlife.
[5, 123, 135]

COMMENT: The Commenters are concerned about the statement in the application that there are no endangered species present in the proposed project area.
[15, 165]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that the Cape Wind guidelines for analysis of birds, marine organisms, wetland communities, visual pollution, noise pollution, low frequency sound wave generation, and infrasound should be applied to the proposed Winergy project. The Commenter also states that Cape Winds should be used as an example of a document to which the public can aptly respond.
[154]

COMMENT: Some Commenters state that there needs to be a more rational way to regulate the rush to develop offshore wind farms. Another Commenter states that a wind farm should not be

approved simply because it is the first one to file a claim. The Commenter states that energy production and our environment are too important to be left to profit-driven under-regulated corporations. A Commenter also states that building a new power plant based on any technology, green or otherwise, in the absence of the Kyoto-based national energy policy feeds the U.S. unconscionable energy gluttony. The Commenter states that a Cape compact co-op or a municipal wind farm like the one in Hull, Massachusetts should be considered.
[98, 154]

2.2 ENERGY TECHNOLOGY

COMMENT: Some Commenters are concerned about the impacts of the effects of windmills on radio signals, television signals, GPS, Coast Guard and airlines, such as planes flying into Otis Air Force Base. Some Commenters are interested in knowing what the magnetic constant force will do to the signals under certain weather conditions. And whether weather such as high winds and hurricanes would damage the wind turbines.
[6, 8, 21, 53, 55, 125, 135]

COMMENT: One Commenter states that energy produced wind turbines, especially those located in the water, cannot compete on an equal basis with large fossil fuel generating units. Some Commenters are concerned about the constancy of the wind velocity in the area. The Commenter states that the engineering involved should develop significantly over the next decade requiring less oil to run the turbines, having higher efficiency and allowing greater distance from shorelines.
[7, 132, 156, 161]

COMMENT: The Commenters state that other renewable energy resources in the New England grid should be considered.
[5, 92]

COMMENT: The Commenters state that an analysis of on-site and off-site alternatives and the impacts associated with each should be conducted.
[114, 135]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that the appropriate method of renewable energy in Cape Cod would be tidal or wave power.
[58]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that photovoltaic power is currently being subsidized by Massachusetts state and federal governments.
[59]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that there is no pressing need for more electricity.
[8]

2.3 ECONOMIC VIABILITY

COMMENT: Some Commenters are interested in knowing if there has been a study conducted to determine the overall output of the turbines, and the associated economic viability of the proposed project. They are also concerned that wind power is not as cheap as believed due to construction and maintenance and that the windmills will not generate enough electricity to pay for their installation and maintenance. Some Commenters state that there are other more cost effective ways to deal with energy consumption. Some Commenters are concerned about who would bear the cost of manufacture and installation, who would profit from the selling of the electricity, and which taxpayers would be involved.
[7, 8, 18, 86, 144, 148, 156]

2.4 WINERGY, LLC

COMMENT: Some Commenters are concerned that Winergy is a corporation that does not know anything about energy production and wind energy that Winergy knows little about the local environment, and that Winergy is only interested in making a profit. Some Commenters are interested in knowing more about Winergy (reputation, experience, staff). Some Commenters are concerned that Winergy does not have the resources to conduct a legitimate EIS. Some Commenters are interested in knowing if Winergy will construct the wind farm then sell the rights to other companies. One Commenter is concerned that Winergy is trying to sneak this one (and the other three close to the coast projects) by while all the attention is on the Cape Wind project in Nantucket Sound.
[7, 81, 103, 113, 135, 147, 152, 154, 164]

COMMENT: The Commenter is concerned that Winergy is proposing a project that would have a few small turbines in a low wind area, the least economical and least efficient configuration that they could have come up with.
[27]

COMMENT: The Commenter is concerned that the ultimate owners and leadership are unknown. Mr. Link is a middleman out to make money.
[158]

COMMENT: The Commenter is concerned that the (project) applications were filed without providing any evidence of sufficient financial resources.
[10]

2.5 PROJECT GUARANTEE

COMMENT: One Commenter is interested in knowing if the proposed number of turbines will be the actual number of turbines built, and if there is protection against modifications to the original proposal. Another Commenter is interested in knowing if the proposed location of the turbines will be the actual location of the turbines.
[71, 122]

COMMENT: The Commenter is concerned about the long-term significance of the project in terms of energy contribution to the area.

[41]

2.6 ALTERNATIVES

NO COMMENT

2.7 PLACEMENT

COMMENT: Some Commenters are concerned regarding the appropriateness of the location, and the resulting problems that are associated with placing the wind farm in the proposed location. One Commenter is concerned that there is no evidence that the applicant has actually evaluated any alternatives to the project or that the siting and design of the project were based on sound determinations related to maximizing energy production efficiency and/or minimizing environmental impacts. Another Commenter is interested in knowing the reasons for picking the area of Buzzard Bay since there are other areas that have less boating traffic and fewer residences. Some Commenters state that the wind farm should be placed in a location where there is less impact on local aesthetics of the community. Some Commenters are interested in knowing whether or not the wind farm could be placed in a more commercial-type area. Some Commenters are interested in knowing whether or not the wind farm could be placed farther offshore where the wind turbines would be less visible. Nomans Land, off Martha's Vineyard, is owned by the Federal Government and has been closed to the public because of its prior use as a target for aerial bombing. It would seem to be a much more appropriate and sensible place to install generators. Some Commenters are interested in knowing if turbines could be placed at Otis AFB or another open space which is not a natural vista or recreational area. Some Commenters are interested in knowing if the wind farm would be less obtrusive if it were located south of the Naushon Islands.

[7, 17, 29, 47, 62, 68, 81, 91, 94, 123, 139, 147, 158, 160]

COMMENT: The Commenter urges MEPA to investigate alternatives that would place the proposed wind farm outside of the ocean sanctuary located in the waters of the Town of Falmouth.

[60]

2.8 CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE, AND OPERATIONS

COMMENT: The Commenters are concerned about the maintenance of the wind farm.

[37, 41, 132, 156]

COMMENT: The Commenter is concerned about who will be responsible for the dismantling and disposal of the pylons once they have outlived their functional life.

[59, 161]

2.9 PUBLIC HEALTH

COMMENT: The Commenter is concerned about low frequency and infrasound, related to impacts to the organs of the body.

[67]

COMMENT: The Commenters are concerned that the construction and presence of the windmills would reduce the human health benefits of the natural areas that currently exist.
[47, 128]

2.10 PUBLIC SAFETY

COMMENT: The Commenters are concerned about public safety, including the potential impacts to children during the children boat races.
[41, 100, 148]

COMMENT: The Commenters are concerned about the placement of additional obstacles on the entrance of Cape Cod Canal.
[100, 125, 139, 144]

COMMENT: The Commenter is concerned that Cape Cod could be liable to terrorist attacks. To erect 400-ft high invitations to global outlaws seems foolhardy.
[58]

2.11 AESTHETIC AND AUDITORY IMPACTS

COMMENT: The Commenters are concerned that the windmills will negatively impact the aesthetics of the view. [1, 3, 6, 9, 10, 12, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41, 44, 45, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 55, 57, 58, 59, 61, 62, 63, 64, 68, 69, 70, 73, 76, 77, 79, 80, 83, 84, 85, 87, 88, 89, 90, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 112, 115, 116, 117, 120, 121, 125, 127, 129, 130, 132, 133, 136, 137, 139, 140, 141, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 149, 150, 151, 155, 157, 164, 165, 167]

COMMENT: The Commenters are concerned that the windmills will have an audible impact, primarily from the generation of high decibels and fog horns.
[6, 12, 16, 24, 37, 41, 46, 55, 59, 62, 71, 72, 76, 79, 87, 95, 100, 101, 103, 104, 112, 117, 123, 138, 141, 145, 162, 167]

COMMENT: One Commenter is concerned that the sun will flicker off the windmills all day long. Some Commenters are concerned that the windmills will have lights at night. One Commenter is concerned about low frequency and infrasound, related to resident vibrations and structures such as houses and buildings. Another Commenter is concerned about the placement of the high tension wires on Gray Lane, Ransom Road, and Woods Hole Road, and the resulting impact on tree removal on this scenic area. Another Commenter is interested in knowing the color of the windmills.
[41, 53, 67, 71, 104, 135, 137, 138]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that the EIS should include an analysis of noise impacts from the Project, and should indicate whether noise from the WTGs will be measurable above background noise from the nearest locations on land in Falmouth. The EIS should also include

an evaluation of the impacts of underwater noise and vibrations from the Project once it is in operation, and any measures that may be taken to mitigate any impact on marine mammals and fish.

[123]

COMMENT: One Commenter states that an analysis of light pollution and noise impacts needs to be conducted. Another Commenter states that a method for simulating the appearance and aesthetic impact of the wind farm should be implemented. Some Commenters are concerned about the lack of criteria for judging the visual impact of placing wind farms anywhere. One Commenter is interested in knowing whether or not wind turbines can be made more beautiful, like the wind mills in Holland.

[114, 131, 138, 147]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that soaring, graceful windmills will enhance views of the water.

[131]

COMMENT: The Commenter is interested in seeing the wind farm built to help cut down on the use of fossil fuel...Let the wind turbines turn. Another Commenter is interested in giving up aesthetic pleasure to reduce dependency on oil.

[72, 124]

2.12 ENVIRONMENT

COMMENT: Some Commenters are concerned for the potential environmental impact and degradation that could result from the construction and presence of the wind farm. One Commenter states that environmental benefits of the wind farm will outweigh the risks.

[25, 26, 31, 41, 43, 52, 72, 93]

COMMENT: Some Commenters are concerned about the impacts on migratory and non-migratory land and sea birds. One Commenter is concerned about the proximity of the proposed project to the Audubon Preserve. Some Commenters are concerned about the proximity of the proposed project and the possible impacts on endangered species, including the Roseate Tern and the Common Tern. Some Commenters are also concerned about the impacts on marine turtles, shellfish, and fish. Some Commenters state that there is fear that windmills will negatively alter wind patterns, water currents, and sea life migrations.

[6, 7, 15, 18, 21, 23, 24, 28, 30, 34, 35, 37, 39, 40, 45, 46, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 54, 56, 57, 63, 76, 77, 79, 80, 83, 87, 90, 95, 96, 101, 104, 106, 107, 112, 115, 117, 118, 123, 135, 136, 140, 141, 145, 147, 149, 157, 160, 165, 167]

COMMENT: Some Commenter states that to dig up the seabed to lay cable would disturb the oil that has settled below from the 1969 spill. Some Commenters are concerned about the recent oil spill, and that the focus needs to be on cleaning it up before setting the wind farm into motion.

[59, 84, 164]

COMMENT: Some Commenters are concerned about the effects of construction and maintenance on the sea bottom and for Buzzard's Bay waters, including how the method of drilling could generate a sediment plume, which could alter the water column nutrients. [46, 59, 123, 144]

COMMENT: Some Commenters state that a comprehensive review of the fiscal, biological, and chemical environment of Buzzards Bay should be conducted on general and site-specific levels. One Commenter requests a thorough review of environmental information and an identification of data gaps, with a research plan that would include independent input that is not provided by the project applicant. Some Commenters state that the effects of the proposed project on sediment transport, water quality, and wave climate both in the near and far field areas should be assessed. One Commenter states that environmental studies should be conducted for a minimum of three years. Another Commenter states that benthic organisms should be assessed for a 2-year period before beginning the construction of the wind farm. [78, 114, 135, 148]

COMMENT: Some Commenters state that a study should be conducted on the impacts of construction, operation, maintenance, and decommissioning of the facility on birds, fish, invertebrates, and marine mammals, and their life cycle and habitats. Some Commenters state that impacts to coastal resources in locations where the cables come ashore need to be assessed [5, 54, 78, 113, 114, 123, 135]

COMMENT: Some Commenters state that bird studies need to be conducted. Some Commenters state that marine life studies, including an analysis of the fish and shellfish species inhabiting or migrating through the area need to be conducted. One Commenter would like Winergy to conduct a thorough inventory of the project's marine and human environment, including the human community's economic and recreational interests in the area. One Commenter states that there is interest in knowing what species, including fish and benthic species, inhabit the WTG's environment and how their habitat will be affected. [54, 78, 113, 114, 123]

2.13 FISHING, BOATING, FLYING, AND RECREATION

COMMENT: Some Commenters state that an analysis of the current commercial fishing practices in the area should be conducted. Some Commenters state that an analysis of the impacts on fish stocks in the area should be conducted. Some Commenters state that an analysis of current recreation in the area should be conducted. [54, 74, 114, 131]

COMMENT: Some Commenters state that the proposed windmills will jeopardize valuable fishing areas. [40, 143]

COMMENT: Some Commenters state that the impacts of the wind farm on navigation by commercial and recreational boats needs to be assessed. [57, 76, 85, 87, 101, 107, 112, 114, 117, 123, 141, 142, 149, 151, 162, 167]

COMMENTS: The Commenters are concerned about the potential negative effects of the windmills on boating and their navigation. Some Commenters are concerned about the "pea soup" fog and its generally hazardous passage with the added potential hazards presented by the windmills.

[6, 7, 8, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 28, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 38, 39, 40, 41, 46, 48, 49, 50, 51, 53, 55, 56, 59, 62, 63, 64, 65, 74, 75, 77, 79, 80, 83, 88, 90, 94, 96, 97, 99, 103, 106, 112, 115, 118, 123, 127, 129, 136, 140, 143, 145, 148, 150, 155, 156, 157, 158, 160, 164]

COMMENT: The Commenters are concerned about the constant use of airspace by low-flying aircraft, such as helicopters and small planes, flying between airports.

[8, 39]

2.14 TOURISM

COMMENT: The Commenters are concerned that there will be a negative impact on tourism.

[8, 24, 45, 47, 55, 59, 68, 76, 84, 87, 93, 101, 107, 112, 117, 139, 146, 151, 159, 164, 167]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that the project will affect Cape Cod's reputation. "Cape Cod, known for unspoiled vistas and preservation of Massachusetts wildlife and waterways, will instead be known for commercial development and ecological shortsightedness."

[148]

2.15 HISTORICAL AND ARCHEOLOGICAL VALUE

NO COMMENT

2.16 PROPERTY VALUES

COMMENT: Some Commenters are concerned about the impact on property values. Some Commenters are concerned that the Town of Falmouth will lose tax income from reduced property values of homes in the area. Some Commenters are also concerned about property tax increases. Some Commenters are interested knowing if property owners that are impacted by reduced property values will be compensated for their loss. Some Commenters state that the wind farms will be to the detriment of all property owners in the area.

[10, 15, 19, 20, 22, 24, 45, 58, 59, 61, 65, 71, 76, 79, 83, 87, 89, 95, 99, 101, 103, 107, 116, 117, 119, 130, 139, 142, 148, 151, 158, 163, 164, 165]

2.17 PUBLIC AND LOCAL INVOLVEMENT

COMMENT: Some Commenters state that there was not enough information provided in the Environmental Notification Form. Another Commenter states that a better Environmental Notification Form is needed. Some Commenters state that more time is required for public review and comment.

[114, 122, 134, 135, 153, 154]

2.18 LOCAL ECONOMY

COMMENT: The Commenters are concerned that the wind farm will negatively impact the local economy.

[15, 23, 24, 28, 30, 33, 34, 35, 44, 49, 50, 55, 59, 63, 64, 76, 77, 80, 88, 90, 96, 106, 107, 112, 115, 127, 136, 140, 142, 157, 159, 160, 164]

COMMENT: The Commenters state that none of the energy from the proposed wind turbines would benefit those who live near and enjoy the area of Buzzard's Bay.

[26, 148]

2.19 ECONOMIC BENEFITS

NO COMMENT

Commenters are listed in alphabetical order in Table 3, with their corresponding Commenter Number. Table 3 also indicates the type of testimony that was given by each Commenter (written, verbal, or both).

Table 3. COMMENTERS FOR ESSEX / GLOUCESTER (MEPA #12995)

Commenter Number	Commenter
1	Bell, Mayor John (written and verbal)
2	Benoit, George (verbal)
3	Berry, Jim (written and verbal)
4	Blanchard, Charmaine (verbal)
5	Burnham, Maria (written)
6	Cunningham, Robert (verbal)
7	Dunbar, Robert P. (written)
8	Folsom, David L. (verbal)
9	Hathaway, Gordon and Nancy (written)
10	Hawley, John and Jean (written)
11	Hirsch, Mark (verbal)
12	Howard, Jody (verbal)
13	Igo, Edward (verbal)
14	Igo, Timothy (written)
15	Jamison, Jacqueline (written)
16	Johnson, Erik (verbal)
17	Lincoln, Dave (verbal)
18	Maloney, James and Joan (written)
19	Martel, Raymond (written)
20	McCarthy, Cathy (verbal)
21	McMahon, Michael (verbal)
22	Penney, John (verbal)
23	Penney, Kit (verbal)
24	Rasmussen, Christine (verbal and written)
25	Reeve, Michael (verbal)
26	Rodgers, Mark (verbal)
27	Russo, Joseph E. (written)
28	Russo, Richard R. (written)
29	Russo, Robert W. (written)
30	Ryan, Micheal and Pamela (written)
31	Schenk, Max (verbal)
32	Standley, David (written and verbal)
33	Stewart, Frank (written)
34	Tarr, Frederick (verbal)
35	Toulotte, Sharon and John (written)
36	Ward, Wesley (verbal)
37	Weinrich, Mason (verbal)
38	Wheeler, Mary Alice D. (written)

3.0 ESSEX / GLOUCESTER (MEPA #12995)

3.1 REGULATIONS AND PERMITTING

COMMENT: The Commenters state that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) needs to be conducted.

[1, 3, 4, 6, 13, 17, 21, 24, 31, 32, 34, 36, 37]

COMMENT: The Commenters state that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) needs to be conducted.

[1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 21, 24, 25, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that the proposed activity may exceed the threshold established under the MEPA regulations at 301CMR11.03(3)(a), making the preparation of an EIR mandatory. The Commenter states that Winergy LLC should be required to undertake a full EIR/EIS review and assessment in accordance with MEPA and NEPA. The Commenter states that a combined or joint EIR/EIS seems appropriate.

[32]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that it seems that under the Ocean Sanctuaries Act (OSA), this project cannot be permitted. The Commenter states that a portion of the project falls within the jurisdiction of the Ipswich Conservation Commission under both the Wetlands Protection Act and the Ipswich Wetlands Bylaw. The Commenter states that jurisdiction of the Commission would at a minimum include alteration of Land Under the Ocean at and adjacent to this site during construction and as a result of the existence of the proposed structures and cables. The Commenter states that affected Interests of the Acts would include Protection of Fisheries and of Land Containing Shellfish.

[32]

COMMENT: The Commenter is concerned about dredging that might be required for construction including proper handling, analysis and transport as well as compliance with state and local regulations. The Commenter is interested in knowing if there are local authorities other than the Conservation Commission that will be charged with reviewing the proposed facilities. The Commenter states that the proposed site is located in the Great Marsh, a State designated Area of Critical Environmental Concern.

[24]

COMMENT: The Commenters state that the project is contrary to public policy and should not obtain permits.

[30, 35]

COMMENT: The Commenters state that the project will fall under the following regulations: Clean Water Act (section 404), Rivers and Harbor Act of 1899 (Section 10), National Historic Preservation Act, and Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972.

[18, 24]

COMMENT: The Commenters state that the Conservation Commission has not received information from, inquiries of, or contacts by Winergy LLC. The Commenters state that the ENF and other materials submitted by the applicant are very limited and sparse. The Commenters state that no basis exists on which the Commission, other agencies, or the public might properly establish the range and extent of their concerns.
[3, 24, 32]

COMMENT: The Commenters state that the City of Gloucester has stringent regulations for siting of cellular towers for personal wireless services including protection of scenic areas and posting bonds to ensure maintenance and proper removal of facilities. If wind farms are classified as public utilities they will need to be subject to local review and permitting process similar to cell towers.
[24, 33]

COMMENT: The Commenter is interested in having review protocols developed that will require evaluation by the Coast Guard on the turbine-related platform on navigable waters and the Federal Aviation Administration on the impact the towers will have on navigable airspace. The Commenter is interested in knowing if any other federal reviews will take place.
[24]

3.2 ENERGY TECHNOLOGY

COMMENT: The Commenter is interested in knowing what the voltage of the transmission line will be. The Commenter is interested in knowing if the power grid has the carrying capacity to accept the energy (at the existing transmission station in Gloucester). The Commenter is interested in knowing what the cost for providing back-up generation and grid management due to the intermittent and volatile nature of electric output from wind farms will be.
[24]

COMMENT: The Commenter is interested in assessing the need for this project, including how much energy will be generated, in comparison with current and projected energy usage for the region.
[1]

COMMENT: The Commenter is interested in knowing if an assessment will be conducted to determine the number of turbines that the proposed location can handle.
[11]

COMMENT: The Commenter is concerned about the fact that there is no published assessment, based on meteorological observations at or near the site and other factors, of the appropriateness of this site for renewable energy production; nor of its economics.
[32]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that the proposed wind farms will not generate enough revenue from the electricity to pay for the project and to justify the project costs.
[26]

COMMENT: The Commenters state that energy gain would be nominal compared to the overall adverse impact of the project.

[9, 10, 15, 18, 27, 28, 29, 33]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that a cost/benefit analysis should be conducted and would have to conclude that the benefit is small compared to the damage, both aesthetic and otherwise, that will be done. The Commenter is interested in assessing how many days of the year the wind will actually blow hard enough to produce the desired amount of energy taking into account the unsteady wind conditions.

[7]

3.3 ECONOMIC VIABILITY

COMMENT: The Commenters are concerned about/interested in the economic viability of this project.

[14, 25, 33]

COMMENT: The Commenter is concerned about the financial feasibility of the project because it is very small compared to minimum project sizes referred to in literature.

[24]

COMMENT: The Commenter is concerned that tax money will be used for a project that only benefits few.

[38]

COMMENT: The Commenter is interested in knowing if the number of turbines being proposed is the actual number that will be constructed.

[11]

3.4 WINERGY, LLC

COMMENT: The Commenters state that Winergy should have conducted a presentation to the public so that more information was provided.

[3, 34]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that Winergy does not have energy-related or renewable energy experience, other than securing an open ocean water column lease.

[12]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that the presentation by Winergy official did not provide any of the information that audience had anticipated to get, like what the project is, what it would look like, where it would go, how it would work, where and how the energy would go from the turbines, etc. The Commenter states that Winergy was perceived as an unprofessional outfit giving a pathetic presentation, is not pro-active in anticipating and dealing with potential

problems. Hence their proposal should not even be seriously considered and EOEA and USACE time spent on it.

[3]

3.5 PROJECT GUARANTEE

NO COMMENT

3.6 ALTERNATIVES

COMMENT: The Commenters are interested in seeing an alternatives analysis.

[1, 35]

COMMENT: The Commenter is interest in comparing the benefits of utilizing green technology with the visual environmental impacts of the proposed facility.

[24]

3.7 PLACEMENT

COMMENTS: The Commenter states that if a suitable offshore site cannot be found in Massachusetts, then the focus should shift to an onshore site.

[35]

3.8 CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE, AND OPERATIONS

COMMENT: The Commenters are interested in assessing construction and operation impacts.

[1, 24]

COMMENT: The Commenters are interested in assessing maintenance and decommissioning (removal after the end of their performance life span) of the wind turbines and cables. The Commenters are interested in knowing if the State plans to assume authority for requiring a bond for maintenance and removal or whether other sufficient resources will be secured.

[24, 32]

COMMENT: The Commenter is interested in evaluating adjustments of construction activities in offshore waters to prevent corrosion from salt spray. The Commenter is interested in developing construction standards ensuring that the towers can withstand high waves, strong currents, and collision from boats. The Commenter is interested in assessing and considering the interruptions in construction and maintenance delays due to inclement weather and high seas, the logistics of safely transporting people and equipment to and from the project, and hurricanes.

[24]

COMMENT: The Commenter is concerned about highway access to the site. The Commenter is interested in knowing if roads like the one going to Wingaersheek Beach will be eliminated from consideration because of their condition. The Commenter is interested in knowing where the staging areas for foundations, towers, turbines, barge cranes and cable-laying vessel will be

located. The Commenter is interested in knowing if there will be a fleet of maintenance vessels with docking facilities (and possibly a helicopter), a reliable communication system, and appropriate crew safety and rescue.

[24]

COMMENT: The Commenters are interested in knowing who will be financially responsible for repairing the turbines and how expenses will be handled. The Commenters are concerned regarding the implementation and maintenance of the turbines.

[11, 37]

COMMENT: The Commenter is concerned about damage to the turbines due to storms and salt corrosion and the overall durability and potentially constant need for repair making the turbines non-functional for large amounts of time.

[7]

COMMENT: The Commenter is interested in knowing if the turbines will remain standing during a storm that is of the magnitude of the Perfect Storm.

[11]

3.9 PUBLIC HEALTH

COMMENT: Some Commenters are interested in assessing the impact on the quality of life and welfare of local residents. Some Commenters are concerned regarding the importance of public interests, including the welfare of the people of Gloucester.

[8, 24]

COMMENT: The Commenter is interested in developing sound estimates regarding the lasting impact on the willingness of people to live, invest, and work in the area.

[24]

3.10 PUBLIC SAFETY

COMMENT: The Commenter is interested in assessing the impact on Global Positioning System (GPS) and communication systems. The Commenter is interested in knowing what happens to a wind tower when it is struck by lightening.

[24]

COMMENT: Some Commenters are interested in knowing if the towers will cause damage to aircraft. Some Commenters are concerned regarding negative impacts to flight safety.

[24, 32, 38]

COMMENT: The Commenter is interested in assessing the impacts on public safety.

[14]

COMMENT: The Commenter is concerned that the area will become a terrorist target when the town (Essex) is presently enjoying being relatively unattractive to terrorist activity.

[8]

3.11 AESTHETIC AND AUDITORY IMPACTS

COMMENT: The Commenters are concerned about/interested in the aesthetic impact to the area (turbines, onshore power cables, transmission towers) and obstruction of views by local residents.

[1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 14, 15, 18, 19, 22, 23, 24, 27, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, 35, 36]

COMMENT: The Commenters are concern about/interested in the auditory (noise) impact to the area.

[1, 6, 7, 9, 10, 15, 18, 19, 21, 27, 28, 29, 32, 35, 37]

COMMENT: The Commenter is interested in developing model simulations for all areas that will see the towers fully or partially, and determining the impact that towers located within two miles of the shoreline will have compared to ones further out that would not create this impact. The Commenter is interested in knowing if model simulations will be created, and if so, will they be for Wingaersheek only or for all of West Gloucester. The Commenter is interest in assessing the impact on Annisquam Light and the flickering from wind farms. The Commenter is interested in knowing if the wind farm will cause light pollution at night.

[24]

COMMENT: The Commenter is concerned regarding the glare off the blades of the turbines.

[18]

COMMENT: The Commenter is interested in knowing if there will be effects on hearing by Pinnipeds (seals, sea lions).

[37]

3.12 ENVIRONMENT

COMMENT: The Commenters are concerned about the impact on the ecology and biology of the area (onshore and in the water), as well as other environmental concerns.

[1, 8, 14, 18, 24, 30, 33, 35, 36, 38]

COMMENT: The Commenters are concerned about the impacts on the marshlands in the area (e.g. Whittemore Marsh).

[14, 17, 18, 21, 35]

COMMENT: The Commenter is concerned regarding the impacts on aquatic vegetation, including eelgrass.

[17]

COMMENT: The Commenters are concerned that the project's close proximity to conservation land like the Parker River National Wildlife Sanctuary, conservation land behind Crane Beach (Essex County Greenbelt) and the Crane Beach Wildlife Preserve will degrade the conservation

efforts that have already been made and supported in the area. Some Commenters are concerned regarding the placement of a wind farm on conservation properties.
[14, 18, 33, 35]

COMMENT: The Commenters are interested in/concerned about assessing the impacts on the migratory and nonmigratory birds (e.g., in the area of Plum Island National Wildlife Refuge, along the shore). Some Commenters are concerned regarding the impact on varied waterfowl (migrating and resident, e.g. loons, grebes, shearwaters, cormorants, geese, ducks, plovers, sandpipers, jaegers, gulls, terns, alcids) of the bay. Some Commenters have concerns regarding the impact of the turbine towers on state- and federally-listed endangered birds, such as the piping plover and least terns, as well as impacts on rare bird species such as the arctic King Eider. Some Commenters state that the EIS/EIR should include documentation of existing bird migration patterns in the area. Some Commenters are interested in knowing if the turbines can be placed at a greater distance from shore, to protect birds that migrate along the coastline. Some Commenters state that the proponent would need to come up with a plan to monitor avian mortality from test turbines before any large scale operation could be permitted. Some Commenters state that monitoring would have to be intense to estimate long-term impacts on bird life.

[1, 3, 7, 9, 10, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 36, 38]

COMMENT: Some Commenters are interested in assessing the impacts (e.g. from vibrations) on the seabed/seafloor, benthic stock, crustaceans, lobster stock, and other seafloor creatures. Some Commenters are concerned about the impact on marine ecology, shellfish (especially lobster) and other fisheries. Some Commenters are concerned regarding the potential impact on sea clams in the water off shore of Wingaersheek Beach, of the small neck Ipswich clam beds in the Jones River and Farm Creek flats, and the clam flats of the Essex River.

[1, 7, 8, 14, 17, 18, 21, 24, 31, 33, 38]

COMMENT: The Commenters are interested in/concerned about assessing the impacts on the fishes (e.g., striped bass, yellow tail flounder, harbor pollock, halibut, bluefish, mackerel, heron, etc.) and fish habitat.

[7, 9, 10, 15, 17, 18, 19, 25, 27, 28, 29, 31, 33]

COMMENT: The Commenters are interested in/concerned about the impacts on marine mammals (e.g., seals/harbor seals, right whale).

[24, 25, 31, 37]

COMMENT: The Commenter is interest in assessing the impacts on marine reptiles. The Commenter is interest in assessing the changes in circulation and physical conditions (vibration, sound, shading, flickering) and the potential structural habitat alterations. The Commenter is interested in evaluating the potential hazard and impact on the environment of electric cabling interconnecting wind turbines and high voltage cables that deliver electricity from turbines to transmission systems (existing system in Gloucester at O'Maley School).

[24]

COMMENT: The Commenters are concerned regarding potential water quality impacts associated with construction, the use of jet plowing, and from oil and grease infusion into the water.

[18, 36]

COMMENT: The Commenter is interested in assessing the impacts of the pilings on wave circulation and sedimentation.

[36]

COMMENT: Some Commenters are concerned about change in local ocean currents causing erosion, and negatively impacting accretion of sand and marine wildlife. Some Commenters state that Wingaersheek Beach (or Coffin's beach) is depicted as a barrier beach in the Massachusetts Management Barrier Beach Inventory and one of the few self-building beaches along the East coast (accreting sand). Therefore there is interest in assessing the potential for beach and dune erosion as a result of air and current interference from wind turbines.

[14, 18, 38]

COMMENT: The Commenter is concerned about increasing problems with shifting sands and sand bars at the mouth of the Essex River, the disturbance of the sea bottom surface and fracturing of rock formations by driving concrete foundations into the ocean bottom, and the impact of wave action, especially during heavy wind and weather.

[38]

COMMENT: The Commenter is interested in assessing flood hazard, water supply, conservation, and flood plain values.

[14]

COMMENT: The Commenters are interested in assessing food and fiber protection.

[8, 14]

COMMENT: The Commenter is concerned regarding potential existing contamination (e.g. with PCBs) in the sea floor and the effect of installation of towers in contaminated sediment. The Commenter states that the determination of presence and clean up of environmental hazards is necessary prior to installation.

[18]

3.13 FISHING, BOATING, AND RECREATION

COMMENT: The Commenters are interested in assessing the impacts on recreational and commercial fisheries. Some Commenters are concerned regarding negative impacts on clam flats behind Wingaersheek Beach and off the Annisquam River and adverse effects on the commercial use of the flats.

[1, 7, 9, 10, 15, 18, 19, 24, 27, 28, 29, 31, 33, 38]

COMMENT: The Commenter states the need for consultation with local fisherman for developing the scope for the EIR.

[24]

COMMENT: Some Commenters are interested in assessing the impact on navigation. Some Commenters are concerned that the permanent structures will present navigation hazards, particularly in fog and other adverse weather conditions. Some Commenters are interested in assessing the need for the creation of safety zones surrounding the towers and how that could impact navigation.

[1, 7, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 18, 19, 21, 24, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33]

COMMENT: The Commenters are concerned that the close proximity of the turbines to the Essex and Annisquam Rivers will interfere with recreational boating, whale watching, and river tours. Some Commenters are concerned about impacts to sailing programs for children and adults that are organized by the Annisquam, Wingaersheek, Ipswich, and Sandy Bay Yacht Clubs. Some Commenters are concerned regarding the impact on sportsmen.

[4, 7, 14, 18, 33, 38]

3.14 TOURISM

COMMENT: The Commenters are interest in assessing/concerned about the detrimental effect on the area tourism. Some Commenters are concerned about the impact on the experience and use of this area by writers, artists, and tourists.

[4, 7, 8, 24]

COMMENT: Some Commenters are concerned about the impact on a visitors' experience at Crane Beach. Some Commenters are concerned that beaches like Wingaersheek, Coffin's, Crane, Plum Island, and Salisbury as well as the beaches of southern New Hampshire would lose their attraction and aesthetic appeal.

[7, 14, 16, 24, 32, 33, 35, 36]

3.15 HISTORICAL AND ARCHEOLOGICAL VALUE

COMMENT: Some Commenters are concerned about the impact on historic and cultural landscape values. Some Commenters are interested in assessing the cultural resources and heritage. Some Commenters are concerned about the impact on historic properties, such as Castle Hill at Crane Beach.

[18, 24, 33, 36]

3.16 PROPERTY VALUES

COMMENT: Some Commenters are interested in assessing the impact on property values. Some Commenters are concerned that obstructed views and noise caused by the turbine structures would adversely affect property values.

[7, 9, 10, 15, 18, 19, 24, 27, 28, 29, 32, 33]

COMMENT: The Commenter is interested in knowing if there will be a reduction in property taxes.

[23]

3.17 PUBLIC AND LOCAL INVOLVEMENT

COMMENT: The Commenter is interest in informing the public as much as possible during the assessment phase, which includes developing more information for the website. The Commenter is concerned that the local governments do not have the expertise or resources to deal with well-financed applicants. Help should therefore be provided to the communities to address the complex environmental and safety issues that wind farm pose, so a level playing field is created. The Commenter is interested in creating and publicly reviewing a methodology for assessment of benefits of utilizing green technology versus the visual, environmental, and economic impacts of the proposed facility. The Commenter is interested in developing a statutory procedure with public participation time lines that will be widely circulated.

[24]

COMMENT: The Commenter is interested in being placed on any public mailing list and in being kept informed throughout the USACE's ongoing proposal evaluation.

[33]

3.18 LOCAL ECONOMY

COMMENT: The Commenter states interest in assessing the impact on tax revenues. The Commenter is interested in knowing if the Town of Gloucester will lose the ability to capture revenues from a movie filmed on Hog Island if the turbines are constructed.

[24]

COMMENT: The Commenter is interested in assessing the impact on artists in the area.

[20]

COMMENT: The Commenters are concerned regarding the impacts on the local historic fishing and shellfish industry and on the consuming market throughout the country.

[18, 38]

COMMENT: The Commenter is concerned regarding the detrimental affect on a mainstay of the Town of Essex economy by virtue of viewshed impacts.

[8]

COMMENT: The Commenter is concerned that devaluation of residential property will result in tax loss to the cities and towns and that in turn will affect the quality of education of children.

[18]

3.19 ECONOMIC BENEFITS

COMMENT: The Commenter is interested in knowing if there is any potential benefit to Gloucester residents from having the towers on their coastline. The Commenter is interested in knowing if the local government will be compensated for the cost of services they may need to

provide to Winergy. The Commenter is interested in knowing if the City of Gloucester will receive compensation from the easements they may be required to grant to Winergy.
[24]

Commenters are listed in alphabetical order in Table 4, with their corresponding Commenter Number. Table 4 also indicates the type of testimony that was given by each Commenter (written, verbal, or both).

Table 4. COMMENTERS FOR PROVINCETOWN / TRURO (MEPA #12996)

Commenter Number	Commenter
1	Bergman, Jamie (verbal)
2	Dain, Carolyn (written)
3	Denault, Ronald and Linda (written)
4	Erickson, Karen (written)
5	Graveline, Amanda (written)
6	Rodgers, Mark (verbal)
7	Sears-Mack, Sally and Breault, R.W. Jr.; Town of Truro (verbal)
8	Skinner, Elizabeth (written)
9	Souza, William H. (written)
10	Worthington, Bill (verbal)

4.0 PROVINCETOWN / TRURO (MEPA #12996)

4.1 REGULATIONS AND PERMITTING

COMMENT: The Commenter states that Winergy should complete an Environmental Impact Report, an Environmental Impact Statement, and a Development of Regional Impact under the Cape Cod Commission Act. The Commenter is concerned that the project is proposed to be constructed within the Town of Truro jurisdiction in the offshore waters, that the buried cable will come ashore at one of Truro's most popular beaches, and that the cable will be on the Truro road rights-of-way.

[7]

COMMENT: The Commenter is interested in knowing why an EIR was required for Nantucket Sound but is not likely to be required for Winergy's proposed projects.

[1]

4.2 ENERGY TECHNOLOGY

NO COMMENT

4.3 ECONOMIC VIABILITY

NO COMMENT

4.4 WINERGY, LLC

NO COMMENT

4.5 PROJECT GUARENTEE

NO COMMENT

4.6 ALTERNATIVES

COMMENT: The Commenter is interested in knowing if hydrogen generators can be used so the hydrogen can be hauled away by barge.

[10]

4.7 PLACEMENT

COMMENT: The Commenters are interested in knowing why the placement of the wind farm on the east side of Cape Cod is not possible. One Commenter states that there are other places not as populated as the Cape that could be used for wind turbines. One Commenter states that the proposed farms, particularly at the Falmouth and Provincetown sites, are remarkably close to shore.

[10]

4.8 CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE, AND OPERATIONS

NO COMMENT

4.9 PUBLIC HEALTH

NO COMMENT

4.10 PUBLIC SAFETY

COMMENT: The Commenter states that when there are storms, lobster traps could become entangled in the structures.

[9]

4.11 AESTHETIC AND AUDITORY IMPACTS

COMMENT: The Commenter suggests that the cable be placed underground once it reaches landfall.

[10]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that Cape Cod area was preserved through the establishment of the National Seashore, with the intent to maintain both the natural beauty and natural environment. Alternative energy is important but not at the cost of the environment.

[2, 3, 4, 5]

COMMENT: The Commenter is interested in seeing an artists' representation of the wind farm as viewed from various interest points along the coast.

[10]

4.12 ENVIRONMENT

NO COMMENT

4.13 FISHING, BOATING, AND RECREATION

COMMENT: The Commenter states that lobster fishermen count on the area that is proposed for their income.

[9]

4.14 TOURISM

NO COMMENT

4.15 HISTORICAL AND ARCHEOLOGICAL VALUE

NO COMMENT

4.16 PROPERTY VALUES

NO COMMENT

4.17 PUBLIC AND LOCAL INVOLVEMENT

COMMENT: The Commenters state that the meetings should be held in Truro, not in Provincetown, and the representatives of Truro should be invited to attend. One Commenter states that the public meetings in Provincetown were poorly advertised.

[7, 8, 9]

4.18 LOCAL ECONOMY

NO COMMENT

4.19 ECONOMIC BENEFITS

NO COMMENT

Commenters are listed in alphabetical order in Table 5, with their corresponding Commenter Number. Table 5 also indicates the type of testimony that was given by each Commenter (written, verbal, or both).

Table 5. COMMENTERS FOR NANTUCKET (MEPA #12992 and #12993)

Commenter Number	Commenter
1	Alliance to Protect Nantucket Sound (written)
2	Austin, Phil (verbal)
3	Bassett, George (verbal)
4	Beaugrand, Ken (verbal)
5	Bennett, Debbie (verbal)
6	Bennett, Douglas (verbal)
7	Bernardo, Thomas; Bergstrom, Ronald; Whitcomb, David; Bohman, Douglas; Huetter, Harvey; Town of Chatham (written)
8	Blazis, Gary; Jones, Robert; Town of Barnstable (written)
9	Borchert, Carl (verbal)
10	Brooks, Ashley (verbal)
11	Brownell, Steve A. (written)
12	Conery, Robert (written)
13	Cronin, Larry (verbal)
14	Curley, Tracy (written)
15	DeCosta, Robert (verbal)
16	DiTagini, John (verbal)
17	Eldridge, Captain Joshua (verbal)
18	Ellis, Carolyn (verbal)
19	Fronzuto, David (verbal)
20	Frost, Patricia L. (written)
21	Genther, Susan (verbal)
22	Gibbs, Commander Maurice E. (written and verbal)
23	Gookin, Barbara (verbal)
24	Graveline, Donna (written)
25	Grimmer, Garth A. (written)
26	Hoey, Peter (verbal)
27	Holdgate, Joanne M. (written)
28	Israel, Tristan; LaPorte, Raymond; Pachico, Thomas; Town of Tisbury (written)
29	Kaizer, Pete (verbal)
30	Kaminsky, Frank C. and Anne M. (written)
31	Kinsley, Carol W. (written)
32	Lawton, Robert C. Jr.; Town of Yarmouth (written)
33	Leinbach, Steven E. (written)
34	Lepore, Timothy (written)
35	Lowell, Nathaniel (verbal)

Table 5 (Continued). COMMENTERS FOR NANTUCKET (MEPA #12992 and MEPA #12993)

Commenter Number	Commenter
36	MacIntyre, Dual (verbal)
37	Marean, Sherri (verbal)
38	Martin-Estus, Kathleen (written)
39	McMorrow, Richard (verbal)
40	Miecziw, Tom (verbal)
41	Noble, Paul E., Jr. (written)
42	Ottani, Jeffrey (verbal)
43	Ray, Judith (verbal)
44	Rector, Barry (verbal)
45	Reichwein, Douglas (verbal)
46	Roberts, Roni (written)
47	Rubin, PJ (verbal)
48	Scharwenka, Mark (verbal)
49	Schwarzenbach, Robert (verbal)
50	Sherman, William (verbal)
51	Slavitz, Jeremy (written and verbal)
52	Spriggs, Frank (verbal)
53	Taylor, RC "Ted" (verbal)
54	Taylor, Wayne; Leveille, David; Marsters, Kenneth; Green, George Jr.; and Cahalane, John; Town of Mashpee (written)
55	Till, Derek (written)
56	Topham, Alvin S. and Murphy, Robert F.; Town and County of Nantucket (written)
57	Ungarelli, Lou (verbal)
58	Watts, Bruce L. (verbal)
59	White, Stephen (verbal)
60	Wood, Hilliard (verbal)

5.0 NANTUCKET (MEPA #12992 and MEPA #12993)

5.1 REGULATIONS AND PERMITTING

COMMENT: The Commenters state that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) needs to be conducted and one Commenter states that an EIS should include an assessment of U.S. National Climatic & Data Center.

[2, 7, 8, 10, 15, 18, 20, 22, 25, 28, 30, 31, 32, 40, 43, 44, 46, 47, 51, 53, 54, 56, 57, 59]

COMMENT: One Commenter states that the ENF raises more questions than it answers and was found to be incomplete. One Commenter is interested in knowing if the same evaluation criteria will be used for this project as was used for Cape Wind, in regards to wave height, loss of transmission power due to the length of the cable, and presence of endangered species. One Commenter suggests that as part of the permitting process, Winergy should be evaluated.

[16, 45]

COMMENT: Some Commenters state that developers lack the requisite property rights to build in publicly owned waters. Some Commenters state that there is no federal law that establishes a regulatory program to issue permits for such facilities, and USACE lacks such jurisdiction. Some Commenters are interested in knowing if public lands can be used for private enterprise. One Commenter is interested in having the state permitting process include areas that fall within the 3-mile jurisdiction. One Commenter is interested in knowing whose jurisdiction the substations fall under.

[1, 3, 4, 17, 19, 30, 52, 56]

COMMENT: Some Commenters state that new energy programs with untested technology should be subjected to a programmatic review to set standards, guiding principles, and to consider alternatives. Some Commenters state that the USACE should implement a nation-wide plan to assess all of the projects of this type that are being proposed, rather than assessing them and approving them in an individual, piecemeal fashion.

[1, 3, 45, 56]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that the USACE is encouraged to consider the fact that the Nantucket area has an abundance of free wind.

[9]

COMMENT: The Commenters state that the USACE must include local government in its review process and recognize the importance of according the towns a more active voice in its review of wind energy projects.

[7, 8, 28, 32]

COMMENT: The Commenters state that data gathered for one year is insufficient.

[34, 43, 47, 56]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that this project is viewed as another attempt to circumvent or misuse the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 and to gain a foothold into the development of such structures in our coastal waters.

[54]

COMMENT: The Commenter is concerned that Winergy or a consultant hired by Winergy will be providing responses to public comments.

[5]

5.2 ENERGY TECHNOLOGY

COMMENT: The Commenter states that windmills are not an appropriate means of alternative energy because they have an efficiency level of only 30 percent.

[35]

COMMENT: The Commenters are interested in knowing if Winergy plans to look at AC-based alternating current instead of a DC-based current, as proposed.

[48, 56]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that a proper study needs to be done on wind farm turbines over a course of years and then a protocol can be developed.

[20]

COMMENT: The Commenter supports of renewable energy sources, but should be used in a way that has minimal impact on existing communities.

[31]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that with the nations energy sources in jeopardy, it is important to put clean available energy in the forefront and aesthetics as a far less important issue.

[38]

5.3 ECONOMIC VIABILITY

COMMENT: The Commenter is concerned that the proposed project is not economically justifiable, and that it is only being considered because of extensive tax benefits which come from the taxpayers.

[49]

COMMENT: The Commenter is interested in knowing if there is economic benefit to the cables coming ashore in Sconset rather than Harwich, for example.

[16]

5.4 WINERGY, LLC

COMMENT: Some Commenters are interested in knowing if Winergy has the appropriate experience with wind power. One Commenter is interested in knowing if Winergy's first project was built and if it was functional. One Commenter is interested in knowing if Winergy will be responsible for construction, clean-up and removal.
[17, 45, 56]

COMMENT: The Commenter is interested in knowing how Winergy plans to handle potential environmental disasters.
[17]

COMMENT: The Commenter is concerned about the intentions of Winergy to obtain the rights to erect a single data tower, with speculation that it is related to funding opportunities.
[43]

5.5 PROJECT GUARANTEE

COMMENT: The Commenter is interested in knowing if there is a limit to the number of wind mills that will be constructed over time, and could the number of wind mills increase in response to increasing population.
[37]

COMMENT: Some Commenters are interested in knowing if a trust fund will be set up or will Winergy be responsible to pay for decommissioning the towers.
[39, 44, 51, 60]

5.6 ALTERNATIVES

COMMENT: The Commenter states that money would be better spent building a modern power grid that could transmit hydroelectric-generated power from Quebec, Canada, rather than developing a wind farm in a questionable area.
[49]

COMMENT: The Commenter suggests finding other land that can be bought or leased in the northeast that will generate the same wind energy capacity.
[27]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that there are other forms of alternative energy, such as clean coal and gasification of municipal trash, that are becoming available.
[35]

5.7 PLACEMENT

COMMENT: The Commenters are concerned that the shoals in Nantucket Sound are not appropriate place for development due to shifting sands.
[17, 56]

COMMENT: The Commenter is interested in knowing if Craigville has been looked as a possible location for the wind mills.
[6]

5.8 CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE, AND OPERATIONS

COMMENT: The Commenters are interested in knowing who has responsibility for maintaining and if the long-term maintenance cost of the wind farms is known, particularly in the sites with extreme weather conditions.
[40, 49]

COMMENT: The Commenter is interested in knowing who is responsible for paying for boats, such as Coast Guard boats, that crash into the towers.
[53]

COMMENT: The Commenter is interested in the incremental cost to the Coast Guard to chart the installation, and to provide all necessary duties, including lifesaving and security, for the installation.
[41]

COMMENT: The Commenter is concerned that the construction and maintenance would damage the ocean bottom.
[33]

COMMENT: The Commenter is interested in knowing if the windmills will have an operational time limit, with a date for deconstruction and removal.
[48]

COMMENT: The Commenter is interested in knowing what the service platforms will look like, and how they will be used.
[17]

5.9 PUBLIC HEALTH

NO COMMENT

5.10 PUBLIC SAFETY

COMMENT: Some Commenters are concerned that rescue helicopters would not be able to maneuver among the wind towers in the event that a boater is distressed. Some Commenters are concerned for the safety of planes and ferries, especially in the fog.
[22, 27, 41, 48, 56]

5.11 AESTHETIC AND AUDITORY IMPACTS

COMMENT: Some Commenters concerned that the windmills will negatively impact the aesthetics of the view. Some Commenters are concerned that the windmills will cause light pollution at night. One Commenter is concerned that the windmills will negatively impact fireworks viewing in the Cape towns. One Commenter is interested in know the color of the windmills, in terms of blending in with the surrounding landscape.
[2, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 24, 25, 26, 27, 41, 42, 44, 47, 48, 51, 53, 56]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that the Maria Mitchell observatory depends on a clear night sky, in addition a resolution (Article 32) regulates outdoor light fixtures. Lighting on windmills would negate the results that the town is trying to achieve.
[25]

COMMENT: The Commenters are concerned that the windmills will have an audible impact, primarily from the generation of high decibels, fog horns, and casting vibrations into the water column.
[14, 17, 53, 55]

COMMENT: The Commenters are concerned that the proposed project could change Nantucket forever.
[12, 20]

COMMENT: The Commenters state that an analysis of light pollution needs to be conducted.
[46, 53]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that Winergy should be required to include sound vibration measurements, marine life impacts, shore erosion impacts, and visual impacts in its report.
[10]

5.12 ENVIRONMENT

COMMENT: One Commenter states that an environmental impact study needs to be conducted, and should explore the impact of threatened flora and fauna by alteration and damage to the ocean bottom, changes in tidal flow and the impact of scouring and materials used to prevent scouring. One Commenter objects to the increased sedimentation from the proposed installation of the data collection tower that would extend 300 feet into the sea floor and have dredge spoils covering a much larger area than 200 square feet. Some Commenters are concerned that there could be oil leaks from the lubrication that is used to maintain the wind turbines.
[14, 23, 41, 51]

COMMENT: The Commenters are concerned that the wind farm poses environmental problems, with potential long-term irreparable damage to ecosystems.
[7, 8, 21, 28, 30, 32, 54, 58, 59]

COMMENT: The Commenters are interested in/concerned about wind turbine effect on migrating birds and specifically one Commenter is concerned about the impact on pintail ducks and their winter feeding grounds.

[14, 15, 17, 25, 34, 41, 42, 51, 53]

COMMENT: Some Commenters are interested in/concerned about: various pelagic species, the impact on fish, the impact on fish spawning grounds, the impact on endangered skates, the impact on sea turtles, the impact on the right whale (which regularly inhabit the waters near Davis Shoals), the impact on wintering seals, and the impact of vibration and noise on marine mammals.

[3, 7, 8, 13, 14, 15, 17, 19, 20, 23, 25, 28, 29, 32, 34, 37, 40, 41, 42, 43, 48, 51, 52, 54, 56, 57]

COMMENT: Some Commenters are concerned that an increase in erosion will occur due to altered wave patterns that result from the placement of the turbines. Some Commenters are concerned that shifting sands and island erosion will occur. Some Commenters are concerned that coastal erosion will occur in the area where the cables come ashore. One commenter is concerned about erosion around the sewer beds.

[16, 25, 44, 45, 46, 48, 50, 55, 56, 57]

COMMENT: The Commenters are interested in knowing about the potential for ice damage to the structures.

[3, 56]

COMMENT: The Commenters are concerned about the potential harm and other impacts to the shoals.

[47, 55]

5.13 FISHING, BOATING, AND RECREATION

COMMENT: The Commenters state that an analysis of the impact on the maritime shipping industry should be conducted.

[34, 59]

COMMENT: Some Commenters state that an analysis of the current commercial fishing practices in the area should be conducted. Some Commenters are concerned that the wind farm will have a negative impact on the fishing industry. Some Commenters are concerned that the wind farm will have a negative impact on recreation fishing. One Commenter states that an analysis of the impacts on fish stocks in the area should be conducted.

[17, 19, 34, 53, 54, 56, 59]

COMMENT: The Commenters are concerned that the wind farm will impact boat navigation.

[15, 17, 19, 21, 22, 29, 33, 34, 40, 48, 53, 56]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that an analysis of visibility conditions, storm track history, and sea conditions in the areas of the shoals should be conducted, and this analysis should be conducted from more than one data tower, for an extended period of time.

[22]

COMMENT: The Commenter is concerned that the shoals will shift and the cables will become exposed, resulting in the snagging of fishing draggers.
[22]

COMMENT: The Commenter is interested in knowing how the Rose, Crown, and Old South Shoals can be considered for development if they are listed as historic fisheries and, according to the State, maritime sanctuaries and blue fin breeding grounds.
[17]

5.14 TOURISM

COMMENT: The Commenters are concerned that there will be a negative impact on tourism on Nantucket.
[2, 25, 27, 34, 35, 37, 47, 51, 53, 56, 57]

5.15 HISTORICAL AND ARCHEOLOGICAL VALUE

COMMENT: The Commenters state that a survey should be conducted to determine the location of shipwrecks, from a navigational and archeological stand-point.
[36, 52, 59]

COMMENT: Some Commenters are interested in/concerned about what the impact will be on the historic and cultural value of Nantucket, since the entire island is listed on the National Historic Site Register. One Commenter states that the EIS/EIR should address potential impacts to historic and archeological resources as a result of installation of the transmission cables.
[17, 22, 23, 25, 37, 42, 47, 51, 53, 56, 58, 59]

5.16 PROPERTY VALUES

COMMENT: The Commenters are concerned regarding the impact on property values.
[26, 53, 56]

5.17 PUBLIC AND LOCAL INVOLVEMENT

NO COMMENT

5.18 LOCAL ECONOMY

COMMENT: The Commenters are concerned that the wind farm will negatively impact the local economy.
[6, 7, 8, 28, 32, 42, 51, 53, 54, 56]

COMMENT: The Commenters are interested in knowing if the residents of Nantucket will be compensated with, for example, electricity or reduced tax rates.
[6, 39, 56]

COMMENT: The Commenter has questions about why Nantucket should be impacted by a large utility.
[27]

COMMENT: The Commenter is interested in knowing where the money associated with leasing the land goes, and who determines the lease value.
[39]

COMMENT: The Commenter is interested in the financial impact of the decreased property values attendant to the addition of such a visual nuisance.
[41]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that the project's economics are subsidized by the taxpayers and government and if unsuccessful will leave dilapidated turbines in an ecologically sensitive and much enjoyed public space.
[11]

5.19 ECONOMIC BENEFITS

NO COMMENT

Commenters are listed in alphabetical order in Table 6, with their corresponding Commenter Number. Table 6 also indicates the type of testimony that was given by each Commenter (written, verbal, or both).

Table 6. COMMENTERS FOR BOSTON / GENERAL RESPONSES

Commenter Number	Commenter
1	Allen, Dorothy (verbal)
2	Bennett, Gregory (written)
3	Buckley, Stephen (written)
4	Cavers, William (written)
5	Clark, James McConnell (written)
6	Cross, G.L. (written)
7	Fenlon, Fred (written)
8	Geist, Margaret (written)
9	Gills, Paula and Richards, Edward Jr. (written)
10	Hynes, Tod (verbal)
11	Lang, Vernon, U.S. Fish and Wildlife (verbal)
12	Perry, Ed (verbal)
13	Potter, Joy A. (written)
14	Purington, Tim and Paula (written)
15	Souza, Ann J. (written)
16	Zimmerman, Bill (written)

6.0 BOSTON / GENERAL RESPONSES

6.1 REGULATIONS AND PERMITTING

COMMENT: The Commenters state that there should be an EIS and EIR with a comprehensive review. One Commenter states that there needs to be a process that will allow proper evaluation and siting of offshore and coastal wind farm projects with a balance between the need for renewable energy and what is best for a community. One Commenter states that necessary decisions should be made sooner rather than later so that there is a more certain procedural pathway for agency and public participation.

[8, 11]

COMMENT: The Commenters state that Winergy's ENFs lack the project-specific information required for an accurate assessment. One Commenter is interested in understanding why the Winergy proposal process is being handled differently than the Cape Wind proposal was.

[8, 11]

COMMENT: The Commenter is interested in knowing if communities in Ipswich, Orleans, and Eastham, for example, can develop their own community based wind farm projects like has occurred in Hull.

[1]

COMMENT: The Commenter is interested in knowing how much money a private company has to pay either to the federal or state government for the right to use federal or state property for commercial use.

[12]

6.2 ENERGY TECHNOLOGY

COMMENT: The Commenter states that by being a leader in renewable energy sources, the USACE can effectively influence public policy in this arena.

[2]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that wind generators are simple to understand but will soon be competing with fuel cells, which could provide cleaner and more dependable electric energy.

[5]

COMMENT: The Commenter is interested in knowing if the wind farm will generate enough power so that the Plymouth nuclear power plant can be closed.

[13]

COMMENT: The Commenters state that wind energy is clean and renewable and reduces our dependency on foreign oil to make electricity. One commenter states that renewable energy has a place in the community as long as it is developed responsibly. One Commenter states that the sight of windmills shows a progressive nation.

[10, 14]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that since an increasing number of wind farms are being proposed for the eastern seaboard, it is important to investigate the resulting cumulative impact. The Commenter recommends looking to European countries to see how Europeans mapped out their resources for wind development.

[1]

6.3 ECONOMIC VIABILITY

NO COMMENT

6.4 WINERGY, LLC

COMMENT: The Commenter states that it would be helpful if Winergy made a formal statement to the USACE indicating their intentions to build or not to build wind farm(s) and then operate them to produce electricity to be sold.

[7]

6.5 PROJECT GUARANTEE

NO COMMENT

6.6 ALTERNATIVES

NO COMMENT

6.7 PLACEMENT

NO COMMENT

6.8 CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE, AND OPERATIONS

COMMENT: The Commenter is interested in the decommissioning and dismantling of the wind generators.

[5]

6.9 PUBLIC HEALTH

NO COMMENT

6.10 PUBLIC SAFETY

COMMENT: The Commenter states that mariners could use the towers as navigational aids.

[14]

6.11 AESTHETIC AND AUDITORY IMPACTS

COMMENT: The Commenter states that the proposed project will be an unwelcome change to the natural sea state and become a visual blight for miles.

[4]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that the cure for pollution problems is not another form of visual pollution. The windmills will scar the Massachusetts landscape in a heavily used recreation area.

[6]

6.12 ENVIRONMENT

COMMENT: The Commenters state that an EIS/EIR should include impacts on migrating and wintering birds, marine mammals, turtles, fish, invertebrates, water quality, coastal resources, the physical environment, aesthetics, safe navigation and fishing. One Commenter suggested that a database be created for avian impacts, such as resources, habitat feeding, nesting areas, and migration resources.

[1, 8]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that with the proposed project, the USACE has an opportunity to show that it is environmentally sensitive and can undo negative publicity generated by massive pollution on the upper Cape by the Army.

[2]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that toxins produced by burning fossil fuels and transporting fossil fuels are hazardous to the environment. The Commenter states that the under sea structures would act as a reef for marine life, which would benefit the fishing community.

[14]

COMMENT: The Commenters state that the wind farm would be too close to shore, which would destroy fish habitat and other environmentally vulnerable areas.

[1, 15]

COMMENT: The Commenter is concerned that the wind farms will interfere with the environment/wildlife as well as enjoyment by boaters.

[16]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that the proposed project should carefully take into account its effect on birds, as visitors will find other states for bird watching.

[9]

6.13 FISHING, BOATING, AND RECREATION

NO COMMENT

6.14 TOURISM

NO COMMENT

6.15 HISTORICAL AND ARCHEOLOGICAL VALUE

NO COMMENT

6.16 PROPERTY VALUES

NO COMMENT

6.17 PUBLIC AND LOCAL INVOLVEMENT

COMMENT: The Commenter requests an alert when information is posted on the USACE website.

[3]

COMMENT: The Commenter states that the information provided by the USACE so far has very little information upon which to comment, such as construction, transmission lines, and no environmental impact evaluations.

[1]

6.18 LOCAL ECONOMY

COMMENT: The Commenter states that local and regional economic impacts and mitigation for the use of public resources should be addressed.

[8]

6.19 ECONOMIC BENEFITS

NO COMMENT